Vol. IV. No. 3

YALE DIVINITY QUARTERLY.

Published by
The Students of the Divinity School of Yale University.

JANUARY, 1908.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

THE THEOLOGY OF ALBRECHT RITSCHL AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE PRESENT DAY, 85
GEORG WOBBERMIN, PH.D.

THE GERMANISTIC SOCIETY LECTURES AT YALE, 99
PROFESSOR GEORG WOBBERMIN.

AFTER EIGHTEEN YEARS, ... 105
ALEXANDER MILNE, '88.

THE AWAKENING SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE EAST, ... 108
PROFESSOR HARLAN P. BEACH.

NOTICES OF RECENT BOOKS, ... 113

EDITORIAL, ... 114

SEMINARY NOTES, ... 115

MARQUAND CHAPEL NOTES, ... 117

ALUMNI NOTES, ... 118

Entered as second-class matter May 26th, 1904, at the Post Office at New Haven Conn., under the act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

The Theological Department

OF

YALE UNIVERSITY

(The Yale Divinity School)

Offers exceptional opportunities for regular and special instructions for theological students, or for those who desire to lay a broad foundation for the work of teaching. Attention is called to new departments of the Theory and Practice of Foreign Missions and of Practical Philanthropy. The Divinity quadrangle comprises a group of buildings which afford a complete and independent equipment for theological purposes, while being situated in the heart of the University, with convenient access to all its advantages, in the use of which there is no restriction.

The eighty-fourth year began September twenty-eight.

For information address the Acting Dean of The Faculty,

Drawer 4, Yale Station.

Yale Divinity Quarterly.

VOL. IV. DECEMBER, 1907. NO. 3.

THE THEOLOGY OF ALBRECHT RITSCHL AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE PRESENT DAY.

(The Nathaniel William Taylor Lectures for 1907.)

PROFESSOR GEORG WOBBERMIN, PH. D. BRESLAU.

CONTEMPORARY protestant Theology in Germany has been influenced by no other man so strongly as by Albrecht Rischl, the Göttingen Theologian whose death occurred in the year 1889. There is frequent mention to-day in Germany and, indeed, in other lands as well of a Ritschlian Theology. It would however be a serious misapprehension were one to infer from this epithet that all the theologians who acknowledge this the influence exerted upon them by Ritschl, represent with any unanimity the exact position of Ritschl himself with reference to every particular question of dogmatic theology. That is by no means the case. Even Hermann of Marburg, the theologian who most closely follows Ritschl, has occasionally declared that in Ritschl's system he does not descry the standard dogma valid for all time; that he is moreover convinced that Ritschl's system must be extensively supplemented and be rendered more profound. The term is nevertheless permissible and has ample justification, if in speaking of a Ritschlian Theology we intend to designate its representatives as pupils of Ritschl, because they feel that they all as contrasted with other theological groups, are in accord and really belong together that is they belong together on account of their common theological basis, and because of the methods of theological investigation derived from this theological basis which are common to them all. For the correct comprehension and the just estimation of Ritschl's theology, therefore,

a clear insight into his fundamental theological position is indispensable. For it has been this basal position and this alone, that has given to the theology of Ritschl a significance and an influence such that only the theology of Schleiermacher can be compared with it in respect to its relation to the development of German evangelical theology and German evangelical churches. It was this basal position in theology which in the beginning of the seventies when Ritschl had hardly announced it, immediately attracted to him from the younger generation of German theologians of the time, a large number of enthusiastic adherents, who forsaking the theological paths wherein hitherto they had wandered, enlisted under his standard. They came to him from all camps, from the schools of philosophic speculation, from the school of the so-called Mediating Theology, from the school of the confessional Lutheran, and finally, even from the circles of Pietism, the so-called Brudergemeinde (Moravian brethren). How shall we explain the unusual and extraordinary effect wrought by Ritschl at that time? In order to perfectly understand it we must glance at the religious situation and the position of German theology in that day. This historical survey will be instructive however not merely for the past. The different groups and tendencies which were then the subject of dispute are typical in character and also play a role—teils noch, teils wieder (some still, some again)—in the present. In the first half of the nineteenth century speculative philosophy, Hegel's pre-eminently, had dominated the minds of men. The philosophers thought that they could demonstrate the tenets of faith and the dogmas of theology by technical methods. And although many tenets of the Christian faith were given new interpretations thereby, although above all, the peculiar interests of faith were prejudiced, the outcome was nevertheless such that, in the judgment of contemporaries, philosophic speculation presented a powerful and steadfast support to theology. The situation was as David Frederick Strauss has ironically characterized it: Philosophy, the haughty pagan, humbly submitted to baptism and professed a Christian creed, in return for which religious faith on its side did not hesitate to accord it the character of perfect orthodoxy, and to commend it to the Christian communion for loving acceptance. Then, somewhere near the middle of the century,

followed the great revolution. The authority of speculative philosophy waned rapidly; step by step empirical natural science won for itself the old-time hegemony held previously by philosophy. The brilliant and extraordinary success of empirical natural science lent it a transfiguring luminosity and wrought over all an enchanting spell. For it alone were the eyes and ears of men open, beside it nought else could have value or significance. A natural explanation of the world and a mechanical consideration of it were the great watchwords. It seemed as though the aforementioned Strauss were correct in his assertion: "The religious sphere of the human soul, like the territory of the Indians in America, whether or no man deplore it, becomes from year to year more confined." And how fared theology in this state of affairs? Only a few still confidently expected to defend the interests of Christianity with weapons of speculative philosophy. Amongst them Rothe and Biedermann were preeminent for circumspection and dialectical acuteness, but their sphere of influence was decidedly circumscribed. Still less sympathy found the others who held aloof from all the results of science and sought to solace themselves with the obsolete achievements of the dogmatic theology of by-gone times. Hengstenberg was at that time the fanatical champion of such obstinate orthodoxy. But the great host of the so-called Mediating Theologians gave, even more, a distinctive character to the entire theology of the period. Among these Tholuck is best known. Theology had in truth, become a theology of mediation. One sought at this point, another at that, to ward off the assaults of science, expecting some indulgence on its side, if he made some concessions to science. But throughout there was lacking clarity of principles and critical acuteness of thought; there was lacking any firm and definite basis; there was lacking, above all, precise and unequivocal methods whose limitations were known. The educated laity therefore were mostly very sceptical with reference to the attempts of the Mediating-Theology; large circles looked down with pitying smiles upon the religious "simpletons" and the hypocritical priests. It was again David Friedr. Strauss who gave most eloquent expression to this temper so inimical to Christian religion. In his book "The Old Faith and the New" he presented

to the world in the year 1872, the creed of a modern man. In this book Strauss has to some degree formulated the sentiment of his day. He raises two questions at the beginning: first "Are we still Christians?" Upon this question he concludes: If we do not wish to evade the issue and split hairs, if we desire a direct yes or no, then we must recognize that we are no longer Christians. Then he adds the second question: "Are we still religious?" This question he will, of course, not flatly deny. It depends, he says, on what one understands by religion. But he will still answer 'yes,' only if one will designate as religion that standpoint for which the conformity of the Universe to Law is the highest idea. But even then he would reply with a decided 'No,' not only in so far as one understands the word Religion in the sense of the traditional religious conception, but also so far as one understands it at all in the sense of a specific belief in God. Are we still Christians? Are we still religious? Strauss had asked. We, that is, we who are educated, we who are not as the theologians of the mediaeval type. And the pride which doubtless lay in this "We" was by no means too great. Many, very many really belonged with whole heart to the "We;" still more perhaps with doubting and uncertain heart.

Then appeared Ritschl representing a new and fundamental viewpoint in (of) theology. A few years after the publication of "The Old Faith and the New" appeared his great masterpiece: "The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation." In this work Ritschl advanced a new fundamental viewpoint of theology. "You combat religion," said he, "at least the Christian religion, because it is not compatible with your scientific knowledge of the world, and you hold the faith of Christianity as a nursery tale. But in this you overlook just one item, namely this, that it is religion in which originate significant standards, on which hinges the life of man—that it is this history from which are derived those qualities on which depend the weal and woe of man. You may criticise the attestations of Christianity as much as you wish, and you may hold the life-story of its founder to be an exploded myth as much as you wish; at any rate, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ has entered into the history of men and has exerted an influence upon the historical developments of man's culture, such as has no other occurrence, that is

an indubitable fact. And while I take my stand under this Gospel, while I proceed under the impress of the Person, Jesus Christ, then for so long do I discover that only thereby does whatever endowment is mine attain to development and realization; then must I, whether I will or no, ascribe to this Gospel a decided worth for me. For there is nothing more valuable for man, that is, nothing which could make his life and his vocation more tolerable or more delightful than the Gospel that has had an historical entry into the affairs of mankind as a powerful force."

Thus the immediate relation of the personal guidance of life to the historical Christian religion—to the Christian religion as a historical power—this is the fundamental theological standpoint of Ritschl. This principle sheds light upon all the leading conceptions and characteristic ideas of his theology: upon the repudiation of rational metaphysics and so-called natural religion; upon the theory of value-judgments; upon the conception of religion with the emphasis upon the practical and ethical aspect of Christianity; upon the prominence given to the conception of the Kingdom of God in its social meaning; and finally, upon the summons to a vigorous Christlike fellowship. Let us now seek to make clear what are the chief characteristics of the theology of Ritschl comprised in his theological standpoint.

If we analyze the theological basis of Ritschl more closely, we discover at three points guiding lines for theological construction, which, as it seems to me, we must recognize as legitimate and of enduring value.

First: Ritschl emphasizes most forcibly the historical character of Christianity; he accordingly attaches complete value to the historical facts lying at the basis of the Christian religion. Thus are the independence and the unique character of the Christian religion brought most definitely into prominence.

Second: That form of the Christian religion which most closely corresponds to the primitive Gospel, Ritschl finds in that religious exercise which is universally determined in principle "sola fide."

Third: Ritschl makes a vigorous attempt to give to theology a self-subsistent basis, that is a basis independent of the mutable systems of speculative Philosophy.

Although these guiding lines are legitimate and valuable, nevertheless they involve, on the other hand, the danger of leading to one-sided conclusions through exaggeration. And if whenever a new theory is propounded there arises an attempt to bring it to complete efficacy, so that one often carries it to extremes, in order thereby to contrast its principles as sharply as possible with other standpoints, a personality so strongly marked as that of Ritschl was particularly likely to make this attempt. We can, therefore, bring out the one sided character and peculiar limitations of Ritschl's theology in connection with a discussion of its three characteristic principles, which we will now consider somewhat more intimately.

(No. 1) (Concerning the first principle:)

Ritschl has the merit of having turned his gaze away from purely dogmatic problems and metaphysical speculations and having fixed it upon historical Christianity. The advocates of orthodoxy allowed the Christian religion to be submerged in the dogmatic subtleties of theological tradition. The speculative theologians allowed the Christian to be merged with the speculative principles of their Metaphysic. Real historical Christianity was the loser in each instance. Ritschl above all, repudiates all dogmatic traditions and all philosophical speculation, and teaches that the Christian religion should be understood as meaning the real historical Christianity that is, Christianity as it originally appeared in the history of mankind and has begun to work in man. Likewise he also emphasizes the character of the Christian religion as revelation. This he does especially in this wise, that he places the revelation of God in Jesus Christ in the foreground; thus has he ascribed to the historical Jesus Christ the significance of grounding all else in the Christian religion. We have according to Ritschl, true religion, that is the true relation to God, the filial relation to God, not otherwise than through Jesus Christ. Faith in natural religion is for him delusion and superstition. Man possesses only that which he has historically won and laid hold on. And man has an unshaken trust in God, a faith in the divine fatherhood in the sense of the gospels, only through the fellowship of which Christ was the author. Ritschl's endeavor then is to recognize and to set forth clearly and certainly, the unique character, and the consequent unique value of the Christ-

ian religion. But in this legitimate endeavor Ritschl has nevertheless proceeded in a biased manner to depreciate the significance of the discipline and practice of non-Christian religions. Ritschl has candidly declined to consider Christianity in the setting of general religious history. Such consideration is, however, necessary, for this alone will warrant a perfect assurance of the unique character of the Christian religion, when it has indicated what the Christian religion has in common with other forms of religion and what moments belong to it alone and exalt it above others. Because of this there arises forthwith an objection to Ritschl's conception of the Revelation. For good cause the revelatory character of the Christian religion is made pre-eminent by Ritschl; nevertheless his definition of its revelatory character remains partly too indefinite, partly too superficial. Ritschl betook himself to the study of history, and in the vicious circle: Historical religion—Religion of revelation—Historical religion. That is, only the Christian religion (naturally the Christian religion as it has the Old Testament for a presupposition) is according to his meaning really historical religion and it is for that reason religion of revelation. Besides Christianity there is no revelation, nor any sort of revelation at all; indeed outside of Christianity there is according to Ritschl—if one wishes to speak briefly—no real religion at all. Herrmann presents this latter judgment even more harshly than Ritschl. But this whole conception appears to me partial. First of all: If the Christian religion is really a religion of revelation in a unique sense then it must be immediately evident that mere historical consideration does not suffice for it, that it has an eternal content of truth which exceeds (transcends) the merely historical. That is to say, religion must be represented as the form of the religious life, which in Christianity (at least in principle) is religion: thus it is not only the religion—historically considered—which hitherto has been the highest, but which also may lay the claim to offering the normal expression of the religious life.

If then one joins this consideration with the universal conception of historical religion, one attains the conception of a gradual evolution and development of revelation itself. This then is the truth of the matter, that the religious consciousness of man develops gradually according to the will of God to

higher and higher levels, in order finally to be raised to the highest stage. This latter according to Christian faith has appeared in Christianity. Therefore, is Christianity a religion of revelation in a peculiar sense of the word; we have revelation, however, in some degree everywhere where a religious consciousness makes itself felt and is fostered. For the history of revelation is in fact the history of the development of the religious consciousness of mankind. This is also the general theological view which gains constantly increasing favor for itself among the younger adherents of the Ritschlian school in Germany. Of these I would number by name Troltsch, Bousset, Gunkel, and Weinel. The great problem, however, which then arises at this point is the question of the absolute character of Christianity, that is, the question whether and in what way a theology of strongly scientific methods has the right to assert the absolute character of the Christian religion. To this question I will revert later.

For the present let us turn to the second of the points previously mentioned.

(No. 2) Ritschl has the great merit of having inculcated again the reformation conception of faith. His purpose is directed at all times to bringing this reformation conception of faith into the entire realm of Christian doctrine, and that means into relation with every single point and question of dogmatics as well. With the greatest determination he takes his stand again and again in opposition to that view which sees the essence of faith in the acquisition and in the rational appropriation of definite ideas and doctrines. For this view dominated for the most part the orthodox dogmatics of the evangelical church. And although Schleiermacher had already attempted to base dogmatic theology upon the real evangelical conception of faith (that is of course upon that of the reformation) still theology after Schleiermacher fell back again into the old intellectualistic attitude. Ritschl took up Schleiermacher's attempt again, and, with energy and determination even greater than that of Schleiermacher, laid definite stress upon this point. At no time, teaches Ritschl, may theology, on no occasion likewise may dogmatics, forget that its meaning for the Christian religion is an inner personal conviction. This conviction is not at all to be separated

from contact with the inner personal life, above all it is not to be sundered from the personal life of volition, and the personal exercise of will. The word from the seventh chapter of John's Gospel: "If any man willeth to do his will he shall know of the teaching whether it is of God." This word might be inscribed as a motto over the whole of Ritschl's theology. And this motto meant for Ritschl the battle against all Catholicism and against all Catholic tendencies within the evangelical church and evangelical theology. The unique character and the peculiar worth of faith, of faith in the primitive Christian sense, in the sense of the New Testament word, thus of faith, as an intensely personal relation of trust on the part of the individual human soul in its Father—God in Heaven—to achieve recognition for this conception of faith is Ritschl's chief endeavor. From this point it becomes clear that the question always uppermost for Ritschl, even in the work of scientific theology, concerned the specifically religious problem, the question as to what form of religiousness, of religious practice was the correct, that is the standard Christian form. And accordingly it was his work to prove the piety of the reformation the higher, as contrasted with the false Catholic form, and to bring the former to acceptation in theology. The practical piety of Catholicism, asserted Ritschl, is not genuinely Christian. And in truth he so judged not merely the practical piety of the great multitudes in Catholic countries, but he so judged even the ideal of piety of the Catholic Church. That is, the Catholic Church has her ideal of practical piety in Monasticism. This ideal comprises two mutually related demands, the demand for the greatest possible renunciation of the world and the demand for communion with God as free as possible from all disturbances and interruptions. This communion with God is thus pure and exclusive merely for the sake of fostering itself. Quite otherwise on the contrary is the ideal of piety of the evangelical church; for its ideal of piety is that of work in the world and of work for the world, but work, to be sure, in dependence on God and with trust in God. Ritschl has represented this evangelical ideal of piety with all the intensity of his strong personality. Therefore his persistent struggle against all propensities of the orthodox church communion for Catholicism.

But here Ritschl has again allowed himself to be carried on, as it seems to me, to a one-sided view. Ritschl is an enemy of all Mystics and sees in all mysticism a Catholic movement of piety. Now there is surely a certain non-evangelical mystic who is engrossed in an indolent life of sentiment, in lieu of practicing religion with an appreciation of the practical earnestness of life. But yet it does not contradict the essence of Christianity for one now and then to indulge in quiet self-contemplation for the purpose of deriving fresh power for the battle of life and of exalting oneself spiritually above the whole drift of finite earthly life, of the entire spatial and temporal existence. And it is just that very thing that the spiritual habit of the Mystic accomplishes. We must also distinguish between healthful and unhealthful mysticism, between true and false mystics. And even though resolved, with Ritschl to hold aloof from all unwholesome mysticism which frequently enough degenerates into superstition and sorcery, we must still acknowledge that wholesome mysticism is a legitimate, yes, an indispensible moment of Christian piety. In this respect several of the older pupils of Ritschl have already advanced to the standpoint which I have just sketched. Of these I would mention Kaftan of Berlin by name. This view has naturally a still greater influence upon the younger systematic thinkers of the school, and of these I single out Troltsch again for notice.

(No. 3) It is indeed the greatest merit of Ritschl in relation to theology that he has given it a self-subsistent basis. For thereby he has made the principles of Christian faith independent of the fragile props of the continually changing philosophical systems. For Ritschl—and I think that he rightly maintained it—only faith—no sort of learning and no sort of speculation, supplies man with the resolution, the power, to comport himself as a spiritual being in opposition to all the obstacles of outer nature, and to assert himself as a spiritual person. For this reason faith alone yields a real and abiding joy in life and work.

For theological investigation it is crucial that the difference between the certainty of faith and that of scientific knowledge should be clearly and accurately comprehended. All real faith—content arises in the immediate direct religious relation of the human soul to God: It is, so to speak, nothing other than the Explication of this immediate and vital relation. All scientific

knowledge on the contrary rests upon the conceptional elaboration of objects, or to speak more accurately, upon the abstract elaboration of our representations of objects. The entire content of faith is, above all things, subjectively conditioned and subjectively determined. It does not admit of a purely objective demonstration. This would seem to signify a disadvantage as compared with scientific knowledge, but on the other hand this subjectivity of the faith content constitutes its great and unique superiority. For only in the subjective sphere can the individual attain absolute certainty, only in this realm is there in general—strictly speaking—the possibility for man of an absolute certainty. And Christian faith will permit this possibility to become reality, since it exalts man into a living fellowship with God and thereby places him in the very sphere of absolute reality. Only absolute reality can guarantee absolute certainty. Faith is for itself this absolute reality and has for this very reason attained absolute certainty—but, to be sure only in the aforesaid conditions. Scientific knowledge on the contrary is objective, that is to say, free from the conditions of the subjective personal life. But nevertheless it is only in this sense that it is objective. It is by its very nature necessarily and always hypothetical; it is always hypothetical in principle even in its most secure and certain results.

The study which we have undertaken in order to elucidate for ourselves Ritschl's standpoint and to make clear the correctness of his views has been a critical epistemological study. Ritschl's whole theology in fact has taken its bearings with reference to a critique of knowledge; and this also is to his credit, that he introduced the critique of knowledge, especially Kant's Critique, into theology. For all modern thought must be based in a critique of knowledge, if it would have pretensions to worth. The great master of such criticism is Kant. Yet even at this point Ritschl has not kept himself free from exaggeration and one-sidedness. Moreover he allowed himself to be led astray into a treatment of the relation of Faith to a rational knowledge of the world, by the mere use of the means of a simple formal Critique of knowledge. He declines all closer approach to specific and definite results or problems of a rational knowledge of the world. In these particular problems of a rational knowledge of

the world, theology has, according to Ritschl, no interest at all. It is its duty to establish in principle and universally the independence of faith from rationalized knowledge. Ritschl however goes so far even as to place theology in marked antithesis to all rational knowledge of the world. Faith, he says, has no point of contact at all with this rational knowledge, and therefore theology has no interest in its problems. But what faith sees as faith, theology can not accept uncritically as the scientific elaboration of faith. Even in relation to faith the assertion that it has no point of contact with a rational comprehension of the world, is partial. It is true that faith does not need to have such point of contact, that it is not necessary for it, and that it has the right to shield itself from such contact. But points of contact with cosmical knowledge may arise even for faith itself. For the God of religious faith is the Creator and Ruler of the world. And theology as science may not simply withdraw into itself in face of the difficulties which arise for the thinker here. If Ritschl does this (and Herrmann has followed him also in this respect) then Ritschl does and Herrmann in this reply on Kant's distinction between theoretical and practical reason. However true this distinction may be in the abstract, it is, in the manner in which Kant carried it out, untenable. For with Kant the distinction of theoretical from practical reason led to a complete and mutually exclusively antithesis between the two. Theoretical and practical reason appear in Kant as two quite dissimilar provinces of the spiritual life of man, which have nothing at all to do with one another. And Ritschl and Herrmann have accentuated the dualism still more. But in this dualism between theoretical and practical reason we can, as it appears to me, not remain. There are in reality not two kinds of reason—there is but one Reason. The unity of the spiritual life may not be so broken up that the practical reason is contrasted with the theoretical reason as a separate principle of reason. Such a dualism is in the long run quite untenable. Whether considered psychologically or historically this fundamental and valueless dualism is not true—neither in the spirit life of the individual nor in the historical development of the spiritual life of mankind are both aspects completely divided from one another. Rather, in history as well as in the spiritual life of the individual, each overlaps the other in man-

ifold ways, each conditions and mutually determines the other. This being so, there arises for the theologian the task, while leaving to the truth of faith its character as true faith, of bringing it into relation with all scientific knowledge and all philosophic problems, and of striving for the unitary blending of the different aspects. Attempts of this sort have already been undertaken by other theologians of the Ritschlian school. First I recall Harnack who in his historical labors preserves constantly the broadest and most impartial attitude in relations to all questions and problems of scientific and philosophic thought. Among the real systematisers or dogmatists of the school Kaftan and Troltsch are to be mentioned as pre-eminent. True they each represent in other respects two opposité poles within the Ritschlian school, in so far as Kaftan strives to conserve the ecclesiastical tradition as much as possible, while Troltsch stands opposed to this ecclesiastical tradition in the utmost conceivable degree. But from the viewpoint which here concerns us Kaftan and Troltsch belong closely together. Both demand that the unity of the spirit life be conserved and that theological investigation therefore come to an understanding with all philosophical problems and standpoints. I have myself attempted such an understanding in my book concerning "The Christian Belief about God," while in relation to ecclesiastical tradition I pursue a somewhat middle course between Kaftan and Troltsch.

All problems, however, that result from this point can be summed up into the question of the absolute character of Christianity, which we mentioned before in discussing the first point. To this question Troltsch of Heidelberg preeminently has directed the attention of the German theologians. And, indeed, he goes so far as to deny flatly the absolute character of the Christian religion. Yes, he has even declared that the entire question of the absolute character of Christianity is due to mere dogmatic sophistries. He means that the main thing is to consider the Christian religion in the setting of the universal religious development—as part of it, and as such a part as for itself has to undergo a development again, a development of different kinds. And this development—says Troltsch—can not at all be foreseen by us; therefore this development might even surpass or exceed tha

which means the essence of the Christian religion. But this view-point of Troltsch exaggerated the importance of a comparative study of religions, yes, the importance of the merely historical standpoint in general. It is indeed a very important and necessary problem to consider the Christian religion in the setting of the other religions, and it is also true that from this standpoint we cannot decide more than that the Christian religion represents—up to now—the highest point of development. For even Troltsch admits this latter fact, but then Troltsch lays the greatest stress on emphasizing that this alone is the only point in the whole question which can be treated scientifically. But there he is mistaken and the mistake is due to the one-sided exaggeration of the historical consideration. We must not only ask what rank the Christian religion takes in the development of religious life up to the present, but we also have to put this further question whether there can be thought any higher form of religious life than Christianity. I am thinking of course only of the principles of the Christian religion, only of its real essence. And if we put this new question—and it is necessary to put it—then we have to answer: with means of thinking and reflection there cannot be imagined any form of religious life that in principle exceeds the Christian religion. That is, however, a great deal more than the the mere historical fact that the Christian religion up to the present represents the highest point of development. That it is really a great deal more becomes evident if we look from the same viewpoint at the other branches of men's culture life. For, in regard to these other branches, a higher development in principle can be thought of; but it is evident that any attempt to think of a religious life of higher form than the Christian religion would destroy the conception of religion itself. It is true, however, that in judging in this way this standpoint must be limited again. Indeed, the absolute character of the Christian religion is not strictly to be proved scientifically. And that is the real element of truth in Troltsch's view. Only faith at last is sure—quite positively sure—of the absolute character of the Christian religion. Theology as a science maintains this absoluteness with logical reasons, but on the other hand it is forced to view the question from the viewpoint of science which involves a certain relativity. If we cast a glance at Ritschl's theology once

more—his theology as a whole—we must say that Ritschl has set forth the peculiar essence of religion much more clearly and especially has comprehended and emphasized the proper value and independence of the Christian religion much more surely and more positively than it has been done in all former attempts. Ritschl, however, has in a rather unjustifiable way isolated theology. Therefore it seems to me the task for the future of systematic theology will be: Proceeding from but advancing beyond Ritschl.

THE GERMANISTIC SOCIETY LECTURES AT YALE.

PROFESSOR GEORG WOBBERMIN OF BRESLAU.

PRESENT DAY THEORIES OF MAN'S RELATION TO THE WORLD-GROUND.

PROFESSOR Wobbermin began his presentation of The Struggle as to the Theory of the World in the last Fifty Years of German Intellectual Life with a striking concrete illustration of the varying interests of the two halves of the nineteenth century: on the one hand the picture of Goethe, resentful over the intrusion of the news of the fall of Paris into the midst of his speculations, on the other, Bismark, who was not only a man of ideas, but also a man of deeds and practical interest in scientific, technical, commercial, and political development, a man also still receptive of religious ideas and truths.

From Kant's emphasis upon critical reflection concerning the data yielded by experience the pendulum swung curiously enough in the history of philosophic thought completely back to the extreme speculative procedure of Hegel and Schelling, to whom even the number of the planets was not a question to be settled by exact science but by speculation. The fuller development of the exact sciences about the middle of the century led not only to the reactionary escape from the domination of philosophy over them in their own realm, but also to a bitter hatred

and opposition to the granting of any scope or validity to philosophic investigation whatever. Materialistic thought was dominant for several decades and still exerts a great influence in Germany even amongst the public at large especially in the form given to it by Ernst Haeckel (resting on an evolutionary form of natural monism), though in general it may be said that the power of materialism has been broken in Germany today. The struggle has been especially keen in this land where the Reformation brought in a renewal and deepening of the Christian life and where on the other hand the power and function of scientific research has found perhaps the greatest recognition of late years. Already in the sixties the tide began to turn against the extreme materialistic reaction and in the last two decades under such men as Helmholtz even the scientists themselves have admitted the existence of fundamental problems, such as those pertaining to the theory of knowledge and of time conditions, which no single science can determine, but which must be left to philosophy.

PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF MATERIALISM.

The effort has been made to ground all the actions of human consciousness in the mere interaction of physical causes, of which the psychical are simply parallel manifestations; but even Wundt, one of the best known physiological psychologists, admits that this suffices only for the explanation of the more elementary mental processes. Materialism has no philosophical basis. In the last half of the past century Positivism tried to establish such a foundation for it by its theory of three epochs, the religious, metaphysical, and positive, corresponding to childhood, youth, and manhood, the few traces of the religious still extant being relics of a by-gone day. But Positivism runs counter to history. According to its theory the earliest forms of religion should have been the purest and highest—palpably not so has history been made: the innate ethical principle in religion has come to ever larger expression.

MECHANICAL CAUSATION.

Nor can any theory of the natural growth of the universe from purely mechanical causes be used as a disproof of the religious element. Such a theory presents a mere arbitrary hypothesis

resting on contradictory presuppositions. If the world-matter had been eternally in motion it could not be called simple, the description which this definition demands. The common distinction of subjective and objective, by which is implied greater reality for the latter, fails to leave the same impression when we perceive the essentially subjective character of the presuppositions of even the conclusions of science. So the picture of the world yielded us by the natural sciences is not the ultimate reality.

DARWINISM.

The assertion of DuBois Reymond and Haeckel that Darwin's theory opens the possibility of an explanation of the world by simple mechanism was a conclusion unforeseen by Darwin himself. It is necessary to distinguish between the evolutionary theory as applied to organic life, whose discovery he shared with others, simply giving it more detailed proof, and his own special contribution of the Theory of Selection, which needs correction and supplementing. The former is accepted by all scientists except Fleischmann, the latter has by Wolff, Herpich, Reinicke, DeVriess and others been supplemented by the view that new species have not always developed by gradual selection, but sometimes by sudden variation. Haeckel's statement that Darwinism contradicts the Christian belief in the creation of the world by God is seen to be ungrounded when we remember that the essential thing in the Christian belief is not how man was created, but for what he was created. His second appeal to the testimony of evolution as opposed to the Christian teleological view of nature falls even flatter, as evolution increases rather than decreases the necessity for a teleological understanding of the universe. Haeckel's citation of definite examples bearing against the idea of purpose in the world might have some value over against naive proofs of God's existence from small details of the world order, but in the large his theory is barren. One of the most important contributions of the lectures was Professor Wobbermin's emphasis upon Baer's transfer of interest from the question whether the world gives evidence of adaptation to purpose (Zweckmässigkeit) to the more important problem as to whether the phenomena of the world manifest the effort for progress toward a goal (Zielstrebigkeit). Then is the teleological

viewpoint the more justified. Haeckel, in his conclusion that even the belief in God is therefore to be abandoned, forgets that, closely as man is related to the animals, he, nevertheless, rises above them and although his intellectual, ethical, personal life is physically conditioned, yet it rises superior to these limitations and offers the best analogy for our conception of God, which surely cannot stand on a lower plane than this, the highest product of human life. Haeckel ridicules religious beliefs as childlike; his own are childish, overlooking the great difference between physical and ethical nature.

NIETZSCHE AND PESSIMISM.

Next to this one-sided representative of Darwinism, Nietzsche is the most radical and influential opponent of religion in Germany today. One must admit the beauty and power of his language and literary style. Indeed he is more of a literary genius than of a philosopher. He largely increased the expressive power of the German language. His power lay in the strength of his convictions and in his unique ability to express them. Not through clarity of ideas nor logical proof did he seek to carry conviction, but through the well-nigh irresistible force with which he could drive his hearers and readers into line. He neglected rational proof so far as to scorn it for the most part, and not to abandon reason for faith as a support of truth, but because to him truth is an illusion, impossible of realization, and disappointment the only thing worth while. There never have been and never will be philosophers capable of, on their own initiative, creating such a new culture as he in his desire for an upturning of all received values regarded as within their power of accomplishment. Any new stage of culture is not the product of the effort of any one individual, however great his influence, but of the development of society. We are not absolute masters of ourselves to do what we want, as he contended, but dependent on past history. His position was as unhistorical as possible. He was the most radical opponent of the religious world-view whom the last century, yes, whom the world has ever seen. He denied the value of virtue, sympathy, and sacrifice and harped upon the will to live. His point of view was that of physical power. True to the pessimism of his master, Schopenhauer, he

saw in these things of which he was deprived the true worth of life. An unhistorical as well as an irreligious conclusion, since sacrifice of life and property has proved the highest developing power of mankind. By no means can every man aspire to be his "Superman"; for the Supermen need the others as slaves. And this Superman we know in primitive times, not as the goal of humanity.

His positive contribution is a suitable emphasis on the importance of the personality as over against Marx's theory that society is simply the result of the mechanical outworking of certain inherent potentialities. This rightful estimate of the actual worth of the personality involves him, however, in inconsistencies, e. g. how is it right to reduce the personality of another to the position of slave, which his ideal of the Superman necessitates for the major portion of humanity; and how can he escape from personality in the world-ground as its ultimate explanation. His doctrine of the Superman was bound up with his idea as to transmigration of souls, which he adopted from the old Babylonians and Pythagoreans without the excuse of their atmosphere and mode of thought. In spite of the number who still attach themselves to his cult his influence is waning.

THE GROWING INTEREST IN RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS.

A decisive indication of the changed attitude of the German people toward religion is evident in the phenomenal sale of some recent novels which deal with religious and sociological questions, especially the romances of Gustav Frenssen, a former pastor of the Lutheran church, who devotes himself now entirely to literary pursuits. He is the most popular novelist in Germany today and no book of fiction has ever sold as widely in Germany as his Jörn Uhl, while his last novel, Hilligenlei, with 100 pages devoted to a life of Christ from a liberal point of view as the panacea for all social and moral as well as religous ills of his people, bids fair to outrival the former book. Twenty to thirty years ago German, as well as other Continental fiction was of a sickly sentimental or pessimistically atheistical type and such books as these would have had no such sale. There are also a great number of cheap popular commentaries and brief treatises on religious, philosophical, and sociological themes and char-

acters issued singly and in series and eagerly bought up. And all this is an evidence of the growing power of religion, if not always of the church as an organization, in the life of today.

"The religious theory of the world is today showing an increasing, yes a mightily increasing development. Religion again comes to be a power in the life of our people. To be sure religion in such form and manner that it is not hostile to scientific investigation and knowledge. And that is, if I mistake not, the same condition of affairs at which you in America have arrived, even if it has come to pass by an entirely different course of procedure. May the two peoples, the American and the German, prove themselves to be more and more the torch-bearers of the true ideal of culture, torch-bearers of an idealistic, of an idealistic-religious theory of the world and a culture which has such a theory of the world as its foundation: Power and Might in the Service of Ideas. And I am of the opinion that the indications of a justification for such a hope are really present. The founder of Occidental philosophy, Plato, uttered these oft-derided words "Mankind will first really begin to rise when either the rulers philosophize or the philosophers rule." It is easy to laugh at these words, when one understands by philosophy nothing but metaphysical hair-splitting and knows as philosophers only dry-as-dust men-of-the-study. But for Plato a philosopher is one who has absorbed all the education of his time; and for him priestly duties and religious education belonged of necessity to this totality. Now perhaps is the time come when this word of Plato's will prove more and more a truth, and first of all in our two peoples, in that in your country the philosophers—the Harvard and Yale men—begin to rule, and in our country the rulers begin to philosophize.

RAYMOND G. CLAPP.

AFTER EIGHTEEN YEARS.

ALEXANDER MILNE, '88.

EIGHTEEN years ago, in the month of May, I bade farewell to Yale Divinity School. Though a member of the class of '88 postgraduate studies prolonged my stay another year. It does not seem long ago, but the complete transformation in the faculty with the death of Professor Stevens, and the resignation of Professor Brastow, makes it appear a long period. The present members of the school are blessed with a great faculty, but we older men know that the teachers who instructed us were incomparable, Drs. Dwight, Harris, Fisher, Brastow, Harper (of whom Dr. Day sometimes spoke as his assistant). There were also Russell, whom many prized, and Stevens, who practiced on us, winning some of the experience and power which made him the distinguished author and teacher of later years. His sudden death was a great shock to us who regarded him as the youth of the faculty, one of ourselves, just a little farther on. The departure of Professor Brastow is the breaking of the last personal link which bound our hearts to the school. His work we remember with abounding gratitude. In all the faculty we knew we had no more willing and sincere adviser and friend than he. May his season of retirement be as happy and as satisfactory as his years of service were useful and appreciated.

We do not usually think of eighteen as a round number, like ten, or twenty, or twenty-five, or fifty, inviting the backward glance and reminiscences. It so happens however that eighteen has claims the others do not. The calendar for eighteen hundred and eighty-nine would serve without change for nineteen hundred and seven. The days of the week coincide with their numbers in the months and the year. My first sermon in Columbus, Ohio, was preached on Sunday, May the fifth, eighteen years ago; once more the first Sunday is the fifth of the month. From this point of view a definite cycle of time has elapsed, and it seems natural to look back.

Eighteen years experience as a pastor have made me profoundly grateful for the privilege of being a minister with such training as we had in those days. One of the first benefits brought by actual experience in the ministry was the humbling of my conceit. I did not know that I was conceited, a condition which might have been hopeless; like the Pharisee of whom Mozely said, "He did not know that he was a Pharisee; if he had known it he would not have been a Pharisee." I was conceited although unconscious of it. I had done well at New Haven, far better than my most sanguine expectation. My ministry began with a good deal of confidence. Fortunately that confidence was soon shaken and finally shattered. I was humbled by the discovery of my weakness and ignorance. To win success in a school is one thing, to win it in actual ministerial labor as a preacher, pastor and leader is another and much harder thing. If any measure of the latter has been attained, it has been because the bitter lesson of humanity was learned in weakness and failures.

In his opening lecture on preaching, Phillips Brooks spoke of "the rich and satisfying relations into which it brings a man with his fellowmen." That of which the great preacher bore witness I also can speak from personal experience. Some things have to be given up in thinking of the ministry as a life calling. There is no wealth in it. Who enters here leaves that behind. Not much more than a simple living can be assured. Something far better may be had. In friendship I am a millionaire. There are men and women whose confidence and love I would not exchange for the riches of our biggest plutocrat. The friendship of my former neighbor, Dr. Gladden, is better than a fortune in money. Time would fail me to tell of others, ministers and laymen, whose friendship outweighs what money can buy. This is the ninth year of my second pastorate, and in both fields there are homes always ready with a hearty welcome, and hearts, honest and true, in which my place is secure. The thought of such confidence and affection humbles and exalts. One could not possibly be worthy of it, but one is always inspired to strive to be so. One simple, plain, old woman, whose life had been a ceaseless labor and care for others, expressed her regard and affection for her pastor by kissing him when the last shadows

were gathering and she could scarcely speak. Not easily could one forget a scene like that.

I have known also the reward of faithful service which was not at first appreciated. I contributed to the battle against the once notorious and outrageous A. P. A., the secret, oath bound society aiming to deprive Roman Catholics of their rights. A great number of my parishioners strenuously objected to my attitude. I was warned that my ministry would be wrecked. Some took it upon themselves out of good will to urge me to keep still. After the folly and iniquity of the movement had been made plain their confidence in their pastor was all the stronger. The man who was most outspoken and obstinate in his opposition, gave me the satisfaction of an unsolicited confession of mistake. "You were all right about that, Mr. Milne."

In the work of a pastor no reward is equal to the satisfaction of learning by indubitable experience that the gospel of Christ is "the power of God unto salvation." It was Lord Acton's remark that "history is the true demonstration of religion." The truth and power of a religion are revealed in life. The logic of life is mightier than the logic of the understanding. Men may persuade themselves that a theory is true; life will show whether the truth is in it or not. This is undeniably true that Christianity, the faith proclaimed by the apostles and confessed by the church, has stood and that it stands the test of life. Men's hearts respond to it; lives are transformed by it; sin is overcome and death is robbed of its sting. The logic of the centuries and of to-day teaches that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."

I have been reading Schmidt's book "The Prophet of Nazareth." I am very confident that there had never been any Christianity in the world if Jesus of Nazareth had been no more and had done no more than this Semitic professor at Cornell declares. I am quite sure also that such a faith will not work to-day. History has not been the illustration of that kind of religion unless it be of the hopelessness and folly of imagining that men could live by it. It was the facetious remark of Jean Paul Richter in explanation of the rise of German speculative systems, "The English had command of the sea, the French had control of the land; there was nothing

for Germans but to take to the air." Some people seem to have taken to the air to-day. Great banks of cloud are mistaken for solid continents of truth. What a man sees or thinks he sees he sets down as a fact and true. Others appear to have mistaken the faculty of critical ingenuity for their souls.

In Yale Divinity School we learned of the self revelation of God, culminating in Christ. We were taught that God has revealed Himself and continues to reveal Himself in history, and that especially did He reveal Himself unto a people, of which the Old Testament is the record, and in Christ, of which the New Testament is the monument and standard. We did not learn to juggle with the word divinity, making it equivalent to humanity. Christ we held the "only begotten" Master, Saviour, Lord, as no one else is or can be. We have found that this kind of teaching wins and holds and saves men. The doctrine of a Bible without a Messianic element in it, of a prophet who was born as all are born, and who died as all must die, may prevail, but it is more than doubtful. Eighteen years is not long, but it is long enough to make me bold to declare that it never has worked and it never will. In the divine Christ, "who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped," is the hiding of our power in the ministry. It is He that "draws all men unto Himself."

THE AWAKENING SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE EAST.

PROFESSOR HARLAN P. BEACH.

THE East has so large a place in the periodical and more permanent literature of the time that one needs to do little more than mention certain factors of awakening self-consciousness to make the situation clear to intelligent readers. For our present purpose four only will be mentioned, as these interest more vitally than others the Christian public.

Throughout the Orient, but especially in its three leading countries, Christian leaders are feeling increasingly restive under

the more or less rigid control of their foreign colaborers. In some cases their relations toward the missionaries are such that they mutter the names of master and slave in discussing the subject. It is true that such extreme terms are mainly used by the New India, the New China, and especially the New Japan ; yet not a few of the older and saner leaders of these lands are none the less truly chafing under existing conditions, even if they see the ingratitude and unreason af open and hasty criticism.

It may be said for the missionary that the increasing friction is far less chargeable to him than to other causes. The entire East is in a ferment which is mainly industrial and political. Japan's victory over a supposedly powerful Western nation has at once imparted a selfconfidence and importance which has inflated to some degree her people. At the same time it has given India a vision of what might be possible if a national spirit equal to Japan's could be awakened. China also has been going to school at Tokyo, and the student revolutionaries find in their hosts the crowning argument against all foreign control. When Europe and America eagerly urge the forward policies of trade and commerce and concentrate their attention upon the Orient because "it is the greatest undeveloped market in the world," they unaltruistically forget that a billion, or even half that amount, annually drained from Asia means in the enlightened sections of that Continent an industrial distress and readjustment which is almost as "terrible as an army with banners." When there is added, save in the case of Japan, political pressure amounting almost to coercion in order to further occidental desires, "slave" and "master" do not appear particularly inapt terms.

Never is the missionary rightly chargeable with the conditions just named, yet Asiatics are not very discriminating beyond racial lines. If missionaries are from America and Europe, they share the curse with their responsible fellow countrymen, and even native Christians are warped in their estimates of missionaries by this racial grudge. They have what they deem a more reasonable cause of friction in the relation of missionaries to themselves. A majority of the native pastors and preachers outside of Japan are men who have been trained by missionaries and are under their pay and control. It is further true that in the

native Church, "not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble" are found. They live in a social, moral and intellectual environment which makes a close surveillance indispensable to the purity of life and morals. Their relation to prevalent religious beliefs and practices is such that the small percentage of men who are capable of arriving at correct theological judgments cannot without the missionaries' coöperation and discipline prevent a wholesale defection to vagaries of religious life and thought more objectionable than those of the early Christian centuries. The missionary feels that he must assert the positions of the Church in more enlightened and thoughtful lands. But that means, native leaders feel, a muzzling of the pulpit and a censorship of Christian living, and this cannot but irritate those who are just coming to self-consciousness.

Another aspect of this difficulty needs to be presented by itself, for it is a phase of the new life of the Orient which is at once a problem and a prophecy of better things. It is the spirit of independence in ecclesiastical affairs which is today almost dominant in Japan, particularly among the Kumiai—Congregational—churches, and which has its forerunners in the Independent Church of China and less open indications in other Asiatic countries. Recent movements in the line of federation and union in the Philippines, Korea, China, India and Japan have imparted a sense of unity and strength which has inevitably increased the desire for entire independence of action and for autonomy. Great wisdom is needed to both curb and foster the new spirit of independence. If it is given free rein, the unwisdom of inexperience and the divisions of ignorance and self assertion will mar the work at a critical stage. If the casting off of leading strings and the assumption of responsibility is not encouraged, the indigenous Church will never become strong, nor will it possess initiative and native genius.

Again, the self-consciousness of the Far East is exhibiting itself in a new aggressiveness in things social, moral and religious. Government legislation in Japan has interested itself in social reforms, and private—usually official—activity in China is turning considerable attention and money in the same direction. Native religions are being shocked into a new activity, so that Buddhists of Japan are sending missionaries to China, even as to

the same country, to Korea, and to Formosa Japanese Christians are sending messengers of the cross. Physical and moral issues are coming to the fore in the enlightened press of all Asiatic countries. So deeply interested in the betterment of the afflicted are the officials and gentry of Peking, that they have opened a number of dispensaries and hospitals where medicine and personal attention are given free of all charge. The abolition, of the social evil, so courageously championed and advanced by Christian missionaries in Japan, is now aided by government and private enterprise there, while in China houses of refuge have been opened under official patronage. It will thus be seen that this new spirit of aggressive opposition to existing evils in varied forms is found among Christians and non-Christians alike.

A fourth factor, present only in the Church, is the growing expression of independence in religious thought. A sort of theological flux is found among the more intelligent leaders of all great Asiatic countries. Most marked in India and scarcely less so in Japan, it is, nevertheless, becoming noticeable in China and the Philippines, and in less measure in other countries. Happily Christianity is founded upon an Oriental Book and adores a Christ who lived his earthly life in Asia. This makes our religion more easily understood and appreciated there. The contention of the native leaders for a more liberal theology for the East, however, is that many centuries of transplantation in the Occident have robbed Christianity of its original Oriental character and that we are now trying to force the hybrid on an unwilling East. Two things are apparently inevitable in this connection : The message which the Church has for the Orient must be dominated by its original Eastern spirit, with an emphasis on the transcendent character of Jesus Christ, at once God and man ; and on the part of Occidental Christianity there should be a desire to receive back to itself the modified product which is sure to come from the great Oriental theologians of the near future.

As one talks with native leaders and with the missionaries of these lands, two conclusions press themselves home upon the hearer. The first is that the present decade is a period of transcendent opportunity and emergency. Nations do not in our day evolve with the slowness of the Middle Ages. During twenty-

four years of personal knowledge of the Far East, we have seen changes that would never before have been deemed possible in a century, much less in a quarter of that time. The tide in the affairs of the Far East must be taken at the flood, if Christian influences are to be most operative. Rome was so purblind that she did not seize her golden opportunity when centuries ago a Chinese Emperor appealed to the Pope for teachers of a better religion. Christianity has now in Eastern regions an even greater prospect of success. One man today has the strength of ten men in 1920. Education, especially in China, will never again be so able to mould the Empire as in the coming decade.

The second conviction which comes to one is that the emergency demands not only men and many of them, but it likewise calls for missionaries of peculiar qualifications and training, if they are to reach a maximum of efficiency. They should be broadminded and versatile, an incarnation of the old Roman motto "Nothing human is foreign to me." They should be true seers who discern in current unrest and hostility the presages of a better time of harmony and peace. They should know man and should study conscientiously the racial characteristics of the people among whom they are to labor. If they can not make friends at home, they need not hope to attract to themselves and their cause the leaders of races the diametrical opposites of their own. Religiously they should be men of The Book, and devoted and manifest followers of the Divinest of Men. Polemics will count for little in the reoriention of Christian Theology : the irenic spirit and an Oriental imagination will be the Occidental's victorious panoply.

When one thinks of the possibilities of the next quarter of a century in these Eastern lands, possibilities a parallel to which cannot be found in the history of the Church, one longs that a vision of nation-molding service might break upon the eyes of strong men who at present only aspire to further in some small way at best the Kingdom of God in a land which is already flooded with Christian light and sown over again and again with the seed of the Kingdom.

BOOK REVIEW.

The Creed of Jesus and Other Sermons. By Henry Sloane Coffin. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1907. $1.00.

Mr. Coffin has laid the Christian ministry under a debt by the publication of this volume of sermons. It is of particular interest to Yale men, because the sermon which gives the volume its title is the baccalaureate sermon to the last graduating class of Yale Divinity School. This sermon well illustrates the theological interest of the preacher and gives a hint as to the reason for the assurance and vitality and force of the volume. The sermons are purveyors of assured faith because the preacher has reached a unified faith and a satisfying theology for himself.

The theological note, however, is not the dominant note of these sermons. Indeed, the best of them are those where it is scarcely struck. Mr. Coffin's power lies in his poetic insight. This gives the sermons their originality, their brilliance and their authority. Sometimes, as is inevitable for a preacher of this temperament, the poetic insight is somewhat too free with the scripture. The sermon on Rahab the harlot is only a striking instance of a tendency to read into the text instead of reverently reading out of it. It is surely not true to the facts to turn the Lord's Prayer into a transcript of the Lord's experience in such a fashion as to make "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors" stand for: "God forgives freely as we forgive, and so has been entirely at one with Me, who have always forgiven my brethren." And as we are speaking of defects, let us put them all into one paragraph that we may proceed to more important matters. The brilliancy of the sermons somewhat interferes with their carrying power and with the permanence and simplicity of their impression. It is delightful to see quotation after quotation emerge out of the rich memory of the preacher just at the proper point, but the mind craves a greater emphasis of the vital points and of the steady progress of thought. This emphasis comes strongly in the beautiful sermon: "Our Limitations," which is perhaps the choicest and most inspiriting of the book. Occasionally Insight crosses the danger line and becomes Fancy, as in the curious address on: "The Fundamental Message of Easter." But enough of this. The ointment is of more importance than the flies.

The great qualities of these sermons ought to turn into great qualities in the character and work of every minister who reads them. They are full of unusual and unremitting illumination; they interpret the stern experiences of life with sympathy and without sentimentality, they emphasize the heart of the Gospel of Jesus; they are couched in a graceful and vivid, if a somewhat too scintillating style; they combine poetic insight with disciplined thinking; they make plain to a minister what a powerful weapon a sermon may be.

The editor has kindly allowed me space to make good this high praise by quotation

"All limitations are like the railroad tracks that lay down the route along which the train of life is to travel, or like guide posts with a finger pointing unmistakably to one particular path of good works in which we should walk."

"Watch two different kinds of sufferers—the patient, wheeled off to the operating table, and the friend who must sit in suspense in the hospital waiting-room and count the slow minutes, wondering what is going on upon the table. 'He bore our sins in His own body on the tree,' but He did not hang there alone. 'They went both of them together.' Who bore the more—the Father or the Son? Who made the greater sacrifice? Who died for us—Jesus of Nazareth or the Father Everlasting?"

"When we shoulder some responsibility, a little morsel of us runs off and stares up, like a Liliputian at Gulliver, at the self carrying the burden; and people say of us, "He's self-important."

AMBROSE WHITE VERNON.

Yale Divinity Quarterly.

THEODORE B. LATHROP, '08, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.
W. IRVING MAURER, '09, ASSISTANT EDITOR.
PEARL E. MATHIAS, '08, ALUMNI EDITOR.

PROF. WILLISTON WALKER, PH.D., FACULTY ADVISOR.

THOMAS B. POWELL, '09, BUSINESS MANAGER, 917 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, 50 CENTS A YEAR

if paid prior to Jan. first. Otherwise, 75 cents a year. Single copies, 20 cents.

The date upon a subscriber's address, indicates the expiration of his subscription. It will be assumed that a continuation is desired unless notice to the contrary is received. Address ALL communications to the YALE DIVINITY QUARTERLY, Box 917, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.

THE COST OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

In the recent report by Treasurer McClung the average cost per year was given for each theological student at Yale at $829.99 with no return from the student. The cost for men in the forestry department was the next highest, but the cost of a divinity student is $375.26 more than for a forestry student. The men in the law department paid back the greatest percentage, 58.3 per cent. The average cost per student for all departments was $284.83, the average receipts per student $132.84, and the percentage of receipts to expenses 46.6 per cent. Thus in all cases there is a gap between costs and receipts, but this is the most marked in the theological department with the largest cost and no receipts. Judged in this financial light the divinity student is high-priced, the costliest graduate to whom Yale gives a diploma.

But there are two sides to the question. No student in any department pays much over half his cost and the average is less than half. This is true of most kinds of education, that the cost is greater than the return. One Episcopal seminary spends $1,500 per student. But in view of the high cost, each student has a debt of service to pay Yale and the world. The conditions after graduation are to be considered. $800 is the highest average salary paid by any Protestant denomination to its ministers in this country, so the average minister is not able to pay back to any considerable degree the pecuniary difference after graduation, and very few could afford to pay while in school the average percentage, 46.6 per cent. of receipts to expenses. The comparatively small number of students in

the department greatly increases the cost per student, as the returns for the art and forestry departments show, both of these being smaller in number than the theological department. It is very important that the very best standard of instruction be maintained in the Divinity School, and if the present students in this department keep up after graduation the record of service and helpfulness which previous graduates have set, this cost will not have been in vain. From this standpoint alone, a great incentive comes for service for which Yale has ever stood. While very few men can meet dollar for dollar the cost of instruction in any department, every graduate, whether he be minister, or lawyer, or doctor, or merchant or teacher, can pay in the ministry of helpfulness great dividends on the original investment of others for his education. Much is required of those to whom much is given. T. B. L.

SEMINARY NOTES.

Dr. C. H. Patton '86, Home Secretary of the American Board, visited the Divinity School November 6.

On the morning of November 26 a fire was discovered in the paper room in the basement of West Divinity Hall, which filled the building with smoke. It created considerable excitement for a time but prompt work by the firemen extinguished it. The damage done was about $100.

The evening of Thanksgiving Day was very pleasantly spent in the Lowell Mason Room by the faculty and students. Games, singing and refreshments all contributed to the success of the evening.

Divinity School men have availed themselves of the many opportunities of late of hearing a number of famous people. November 4 J. G. Phelps Stokes and his wife, Rose Pastor Stokes, spoke at Foy Auditorium on "Socialism." November 29 Hon. W. J. Bryan spoke on the Green at the dedication of the Bennett fountain and in the evening at Woolsey Hall on "The Individual and the Government." December 2 Dr. Wilfred T. Grenfell of Labrador, gave an illustrated lecture on his work in that country.

Dr. E. S. Hume, instructor in Missions, has been compelled to give up class room work because of a severe illness. He is now at the Presbyterian Hospital in New York City.

P. E. Mathias '08 and R. E. Chandler '10 attended the International Convention of the Y. M. C. A. at Washington, November, 22-26 as delegates from the Divinity School Y. M. C. A. and gave an interesting report on their return.

The Divinity School Glee Club has elected T. B. Lathrop '08 as leader in place of W. I. Maurer '09, who resigned because of pressure of other work. Professor W. E. Haesche is musical director. The club will give a concert in the winter term.

L. C. Porter '06 was a recent visitor. He is in New York taking special work preparatory to his going to North China College next year as a teacher.

Harry Grimes '08 was elected vice-president and M. F. Wittler secretary of the Y. M. C. A., to fill vacancies in these offices.

A number of alumni who came to the Princeton game visited the Divinity School November 16.

The men taking Practical Sociology under Professor Bailey have enjoyed addresses made before the combined classes in Osborn Hall. On November 1 Mr. Henry Clews of New York gave an address on "The Fundamentals of Business Success." November 8 Professor E. A. Steiner of Grinnell College spoke on "The Immigrant" in an illuminating way. November 27 Robert Hunter of New York spoke on "Social Problems in Art and Literature." December 4 Dr. Walter Laidlaw of the New York Federation of Churches spoke on "Church Problems in the City as Affected by Immigration."

In the entrance examinations for Fogg and Allis Scholarships in the Junior Class, the following men were awarded Allis Scholaships: Robert Elmer Chandler '10 of Auburndale, Mass.; Edwin Deeks Harvey '10 of Rock Ferry, England; Milton Frederick Wittler '10 of Seattle, Wash.

The Fall term closed December 18 and the Winter term will open January 8, 1908.

The Stevens Theological Club has had an interesting series of addresses this term. On October 10 Professor Wobbermin of Breslau addressed the club on "Ritschl and Schlereimacher." On October 31 Mr. M. T. Kalaidjian presented a paper on "Speaking With Authority and Under Authority." On November 14 Dr. F. J. McConnell of Brooklyn gave an address on "Religious Certainty." The next meeting of the club will be on January 16, when Professor George T. Ladd will give the address.

Professor Beach, from whose pen an article appears in this number of the QUARTERLY, is spending the year abroad getting fresh material for his mission classes. He gave the Commencement Address in Chinese at the first graduation exercises of Yale Mission College in Changsha, China. In this address he showed the aims and methods of the college in bringing Western learning to the heart of China. Twenty-eight students are now enrolled.

The Yale Corporation has conferred on Professor Ambrose W. Vernon the honorary degree of Master of Arts.

T. B. L.

MARQUAND CHAPEL NOTES.

Secretary William Shaw on October 28 emphasized the great necessity of work for and by the young people of the church, to which purpose the Christian Endeavor is well adapted. The future of the church depends on the efficiency of this work.

Professor E. A. Steiner on November 8 brought a very stimulating message on the requirements for a successful ministry. Knowledge of people, sympathy, heroism, humility and faith are the fundamentals of this great work. The speaker's wit, wisdom and earnestness made a great impression.

On November 1 President E. Lyman Hood of Atlanta brought "A Message from the Southland." He portrayed the awakening of the New South industrially and the influx of Northern people. The consequent importance of the religious work and its hopeful outlook he graphically portrayed.

Rev. John S. Chander '73 of the Madura Mission of the A. B. C. F. M. explained in an interesting way, on November 11, the condition of missionary work in India at the present time, its difficulties, its hopes, its successes. The imperative necessity of striking now when the nation can be moulded was clearly shown.

Another missionary address of thrilling character was that by Rev John Moody of the Congo Mission on November 13. He painted vivid pictures of the work as he knew it and the remarkable energy with which he told his story, and the well-selected details, made a clear impression of this awakening region.

Rev. Joseph H. Robinson of White Plains, New York, gave a very helpful devotional talk on November 15, in regard to a minister's knowledge of the real Jesus. This is the secret of great preaching and true life, and without it the message is halting and uncertain.

"The Sincerity of the Minister" was presented on December 6 by Dr. Gerald H. Beard '90 of Bridgeport. Nowhere is this quality needed more than in a minister's relations to his own conscience, to his people and to the community at large. Equivocation and quibbling with the truth, be it in parish work, personal religion or politics, are wrong beyond a doubt. Sincerity is to be more valued than personal comfort.

The Chapman evangelistic campaign was portrayed by Rev. George Robinson of Holyoke of December 13. He told of the great success of the recent work by Dr. Chapman and his assistants in Holyoke. This work is characterized by business organization and methods. "The King's Business." The address had additional interest from the fact of Dr. Chapman's New Haven campaign, which will begin on January 6.

T. B. L.

ALUMNI NOTES.

1874—Rev. Joel S. Ives spent the Summer in Europe.—Rev. N. M. Calhoun declines call to Suffield, Conn.

1885—During the recent National Council at Cleveland, O., Mrs. M. G. Smith gave a reception to the Class of '85. Those present were Rev. and Mrs. E. H. Burt, Rev. and Mrs. J. C. Cromer, Rev. and Mrs. C. L. Kloss, Rev. and Mrs. T. P. Thomas, Rev. and Mrs. C. H. Small, Pres. Norman Plass, Pres. E. Lyman Hood.

1889—Rev. Theodore D. Bacon of Flint, Mich., has accepted a call to the North Unitarian Church of Salem, Mass.

1891—Rev. W. C. Gordon,, of the Second Congregational Church at Westfield, Mass., has been called to the First Presbyterian Church of Albany, N. Y.

1892—C. F. Luther accepts call to North Congregational Church, Providence, R. I.

1893—E. S. Bromer has resigned from the faculty of Ursinus School of Theology at Collegeville, Pa., and accepted the pastorate of the First Reformed Church of Greensburg, Pa.

1896—Rev. Wm. M. Hess, Ph. D., was installed in Trinity Congregational Church, New York City, on October 31. Prof. L. O. Brastow preached the sermon.

1897—Rev. George C. Ladd has accepted call to Red Oak, Iowa.—Rev. Benjamin M. Wright, of Orange, Conn., died November 17, in New York City, after an operation for nasal trouble.

1902—Frederick W. Raymond resigns at Hamilton, N. Y., after a pastorate of four and a half years, and accepts call to Union Church, Proctor, Vt.

1904—Adams, E. B., since May 1st has been at Ramona, Cal., succeeding S. R. Fisher (Special '05). The climate is agreeing better with his physical condition than anything he found since his breakdown in the winter of '04–'05. He is enjoying work with encouraging as well as disheartening results, reaching especially the men and the children. He is

IMPORTANT NEW BOOKS

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST

By JAMES ORR, D.D.
Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in United Free Church College, Glasgow.

Dr. Orr delivered these important lectures last year, when they aroused the most wide-spread interest. They are a broad yet conservative statement of this great discussion. In his preface Dr. Orr says: "The aim of the lectures is to establish faith in the miracle of the Lord's Incarnation by Birth from the Virgin, to meet objections, and to show the intimate connection of fact and doctrine in this transcendent mystery."

12 mo. $1.50 net. (Postage 12 cents)

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

By DAVID S. SCHAFF, D.D.

Vol. V., Part I. The new volume of this great work covers the period from Gregory VII, 1049, to Boniface VIII., 1294.

Six volumes written by Philip Schaff have already been published and are acknowledged to be the great authority on this subject. $3.25 net. (Postage 30 cents)

THE CREED OF JESUS and Other Sermons

By HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, D.D.
Pastor of Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, and Lecturer in Union Theo. Seminary.

An untechnical and popular statement of the Christian Gospel based on the idea that the message of Christianity arose from, and is to be found authoritatively in, the religious experience of its founder. $1.00 net. (Postage 10 cents)

CANON AND TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

By CASPAR RENE GREGORY, D.D., LL.D.
Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Leipzig.

A new volume in the International Theological Library, containing an able and scholarly treatise on this subject.

$2.50 net. (Postage extra)

HISTORY OF BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA

By HUGO WINCKLER Translated by Prof. JAMES A. CRAIG

"The most authoritative account of the History of the Babylonians and Assyrians before the Persian Conquest that can be found in the English language.—*N. Y. Sun.*

$1.50 net. (Postage 12 cents)

EPOCHS IN THE LIFE OF JESUS

By A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D.
Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

A unique presentation of the life of Christ interpreted in terms of the Master's teaching and spiritual experience, which are discussed in chronological sequence, assuming the reader's knowledge of the familiar biographical outline. The division into Epochs gives the chain of commentary life and unity, and the spirit of the style endues the work with an altogether unusual vividness and vivacity. Its exposition is not merely eloquent but remarkably pungent and pithy, without of course any sacrifice of real reverence. $1.00 net. (Postage extra)

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

glad of the broad training and vision of truth received in the Seminary, but finds, for pulpit use, his chief interest in the Bible still to be for its religious truths—these are what the people hunger for.

1905—George W. Driver was ordained and installed in First Church, Exeter, N. H., November 20. Professors Bacon and Brastow took part in the service.

1906—Thomas E. Nugent was ordained at Meriden, Conn., October 25. Professor A. W. Vernon preached the sermon. Professor E. L. Curtis and Professor L. O. Brastow had other parts in the service.

1907—C. M. Calderwood was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church of Mianus, Conn., November 15. Rev. Joel S. Ives, '74, delivered the address.—A. T. Steele was recently installed at Bethel, Conn.

Twenty-five members of the Yale Theological Alumni Association of Wisconsin held a banquet at the Tremont Hoted at Oshkosh, Wis., during the sessions of the Congregational Convention the first week in October. Professor W. J. Mutch '85 was elected president and Rev. J. E. Sarles '98, secretary. A committee composed of Rev. Henry Stauffer '89, Rev. L. H. Keller '89 and Senator J. M. Whitehead '77 (Yale College) reported that a consolidation with the general State Alumni Association was not at present feasible. W. A. Rowell '06, W. J. Mutch '85 and H. B. Hunting '04 were among the speakers. P. E. M.

GRENON BROTHERS,
139 CHURCH STREET,
Restaurant and Quick Lunch.
For quick and clean service of wholesome food, try us once for our sake, then you will come for your own.

HATS, HABERDASHERY, SHOES AND MEN'S CLOTHING.
SOLE AGENTS FOR
Atterbury System Clothes.
LAMBERT
854 Chapel Street, - - N. Y. Store, 39-41 Cortland St.

J. J. KRAFT,
Merchant Tailor,
26 CENTER STREET, NEW HAVEN, CONN.